

~~SECRET~~

55

January 4th, 1960COCOM Document No. 3715.68/2 BCOORDINATING COMMITTEERECORD OF DISCUSSIONONITEM 1568 - CONTROL EQUIPMENT8th and 9th December, 1959

Present: Belgium (Luxembourg), Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, United Kingdom, United States.

References: COCOM Documents Nos. 3700.5, 3715.00/1, 3715.68/1 and W.P.1568/1 and 2.

1. The CHAIRMAN invited Delegates to resume the study of the proposed United States amendment, which had not secured universal support during the first phase of the discussions.
2. The FRENCH Delegate recalled his previous statement to the effect that his Delegation were unable to accept the addition of a sub-item (h), at any rate as at present conceived. The Delegate said that, before taking a final decision as to the addition of this sub-item, his Delegation would hope that the Committee could first settle the question of the heading to the item, which in its present form gave rise to divergencies of interpretation. With reference to resolving power, the French Delegation had noted that for certain types of equipment included in the present item, this could attain the figure of  $10^4$ . The French Delegate stated that if the cut-off of  $10^3$  was accepted, Item 1568 would need to be completely revised.
3. The GERMAN Delegate expressed agreement with the French Delegation's view that the present heading was of too general a nature. It could scarcely be claimed that an amplifier was covered by the term "control equipment". He stated further that his Delegation had some hesitation in accepting "with a resolving power better than one part in  $10^3$ " as proposed by the United States Delegation.
4. The UNITED STATES Delegate pointed out that his Delegation's motive in adding this resolving power factor to their original proposal had been to meet the wishes of some Delegations desiring to free certain types of equipment which had industrial uses and slight, or no strategic significance.
5. The UNITED KINGDOM Delegate did not question the usefulness of protecting certain types of equipment, but he wished to know exactly which, in view of the fact that all this equipment was widely used in industry. The Delegate considered that it would not be enough to refer exclusively to the resolving power unless a measuring-time cut-off were also provided. By way of illustration, the Delegate stated that a converter could be produced by using a ratchet-wheel with 1,000 teeth, which was a very well-known mechanical practice. Referring to the change in the heading proposed by the French Delegation, the Delegate enquired whether this was a simple question of clarification or a matter of substance calling for study.
6. The GERMAN Delegate stated that, if he had understood correctly the French position regarding the heading, there had not been any proposal but rather a suggestion that there should be some clarification. The Delegate concurred with the French Delegation's view that the expression "control equipment" might lead to misunderstanding. Naturally it might be argued

~~SECRET~~

S E C R E T

- 2 -

COCOM Document No. 3715.68/2 B

that the heading was of less importance than the body of the text, but he believed that it would nevertheless be useful to try to find a less restrictive definition. The Delegate made the two following suggestions: either to say "control equipment n.e.s.", or else "component parts for control equipment", because in fact it was component parts that were chiefly concerned. The Delegate stated that the aim of Item 1568 was to cover all sub-products, whatever their field of employment: computers, fire control or automation. He had already put forward two proposals. He could suggest a third: to retain the present heading and add an Interpretative Note.

7. The FRENCH Delegate said that the expression "control equipment" could be interpreted as covering either fire control equipment or control equipment for use in automatism. Judging from previous discussions, he had considered that fire control equipment was concerned. The Delegate enquired whether the expression "sub-assemblies and parts for automation equipment" would cover only industrial equipment or would also cover fire control equipment.

8. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that it had been proposed that more importance should be attached to the list in Item 1568 than to the heading, which would remain fairly general. He therefore asked the French Delegation to be good enough to study the question from this point of view.

9. The FRENCH Delegate stated that his Delegation, to escape from the present blind-alley, could accept the following heading for the French version: "Matériel de commande ci-dessous spécifié" ("Control equipment as specified below"). Furthermore, in the French text of sub-item (c), the Delegate considered that it would be preferable to keep the English word "resolver" instead of the French word "calculateur". The Committee agreed to these two proposals.

10. The CHAIRMAN stated that at this stage of the debate it appeared possible to conclude that, after examining the proposal submitted by the United States, the Committee recognised it as deserving of further study.

11. The FRENCH Delegate concurred in the Chairman's interpretation. He wished however to draw the United States Delegation's attention to the following point. If the factor of resolving power were introduced, the French Delegate considered that the time factor should also be studied. The United Kingdom Delegate had explained that by devoting more time to the operation the desired precision could be obtained through recourse to the simplest of mechanical practices. The French Delegate pointed out, in connection with the proposed sub-item (h), that it should not be forgotten that where converters were concerned the equipment listed in Item 1568 could be used in combination and that each type of equipment had its own margin of error. The sum total of error, therefore, must not be such as to prevent the attainment of the required resolving power. In other words, the resolving power factor to be established should delimit the characteristics of these types of equipment: synchros, resolvers, linear induction potentiometers, induction rate generators, servo motors, etc.

12. The UNITED STATES Delegate said that he would forward to his authorities the observations just made by his French colleague. He would endeavour to obtain precise replies to the questions which the French and United Kingdom Delegates had raised concerning the United States proposal, and hoped that these replies would arrive before the close of the current review. He drew his French colleague's attention to one point, however. He was not certain that it could be affirmed that the resolving power would delimit all the characteristics of the equipment mentioned in Item 1568. He stressed the fact that the United States proposal concerning converters attempted to exclude equipment of less strategic significance.

S E C R E T

- 3 -

COCOM Document No. 3715.68/2 B

13. The GERMAN Delegate stated that this very complex item had been accepted by the Committee between two reviews, without the assistance of experts and without knowing exactly what it involved. The Delegate considered that it would be logical to re-examine this item, and thought that the Committee might resume its study in the course of the following year.

14. The FRENCH Delegate stated further that he had been struck by the differences which existed between the various types of equipment covered by Item 1568. He thought that this item had been drafted at least ten years previously. Certain figures in the definition related to non-strategic equipment of the most ordinary nature and now clearly superseded. The Delegate said that, for example, in the case of linear induction potentiometers, he had been informed that those with a rated linearity of only 1 per 1,000 were rejected. The Delegate concluded that the item needed to be completely re-shaped and the figures studied afresh; on that occasion the definition of resolving power could be used in an attempt to set new cut-offs.

15. The COMMITTEE noted the concern of the French and German Delegates and indicated a willingness to examine the item before the next List Review. It was suggested that because of the highly technical aspects of this definition any proposal to modify the present definition be accompanied by a document setting forth detailed technical explanations and a statement of the justification for any proposed changes. The Committee agreed that discussion of the United States proposal would be re-opened whenever the United States Delegation was prepared to make further comment.

CONCLUSION: The COMMITTEE agreed to retain ~~the~~ the definition unchanged except for certain agreed editorial changes in the French version of the definition:

Heading: "Matériel ci-dessous spécifié".

Definition: Substitute the word "resolver" for the word "calculateur" wherever it occurs in the definition.

The Committee agreed furthermore that the item would be re-examined when any Delegation should submit new and detailed information on which an amendment of this definition might be based.

S E C R E T